a simple man, a quiet man and a peaceful man who enjoys the simple things in life. He enjoys and appreciates the unsurpassed beauty that exists in nature. Most of us will be denied the great prizes in life, the Pulitzer, the Nobel Peace Prize, the Oscars, the Tonys, and the Emmys; but we are all eligible for life's simple pleasures, a pat on the back, a four-pound bass, an empty parking space, a crackling fire, a gorgeous sunset, hot soup or cold beer. Well, Douglas Leuschen will never be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize or perhaps an Oscar or a Tony. He does cherish these simple things, yet the prosecution seeks to condemn this man. And their proof for their request for you to condemn him is that he hunts woodchucks in February.

we all well know. There is a lot of curiosity through the history. And about 150 years ago there was a man, he took his gun, he borrowed his neighbor's ax, he went down by a pond and he dug a hole. He lived in that hole for several weeks and then even more curiously, he went and bought his neighbor's house. But instead of moving in the house, he took the house down and moved into his hole next to the pond and rebuilt the house. And there he stayed in that house on top of his little hole for two years and two months. This is in Concord,

1

1

Massachusetts. You can imagine what some of the people thought about this curiosity, this stranger. Probably some of them thought he was weird and probably a lot more. But that man was a man by the name of Henry David Thoreau, and he explained his behavior as He said, quote, I went to the woods because I wished to live deliberately to front only the essential facts of life, and to see if I cannot learn what it had to teach, and not when I came to die, discover that I had not lived. And we hold these words out with great pride as a tremendous example of the accomplishments of one of our greatest literary individuals. But yet at the same time here in this courtroom today, the prosecution seeks to condemn a man who is attempting and who has tried to fulfill that same dream.

The law in this case, ladies and gentlemen, is relatively simple. The charge is carrying a firearm without a license, that's the general rule. Now, there are two exceptions to that general rule that I think are important today. Now, you have been told earlier and I'm going to say it again, the Judge will instruct you subsequent to my closing argument and to Mr. Zak's closing argument on what the law is. But briefly, those exceptions say that if you're target practicing or hunting, you're going to or from those places or in

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

47

Now, the Commonwealth has the burden of proving a violation of this law, and the standard of proof in this case is beyond a reasonable doubt. Now, we have all heard that term many times and we have an idea of what it means. Let me give you the legal definition of it because I think it's important to know and I think the more a jury knows, the better qualified a jury is to render a decision. A reasonable doubt exists if in considering all the facts and circumstances in evidence, you're caused to pause or hesitate in reaching your conclusion. Ladies and gentlemen, I suggest to you that there is not one nor two nor three reasonable doubts in this case, but the whole case that's been presented by the prosecutor from beginning to end raises nothing but reasonable doubt after reasonable doubt after reasonable doubt.

I anticipate that the prosecution is going to get up here and tell you he wasn't target practicing, he wasn't hunting, we don't know what he was doing, but he wasn't doing those things. And I suggest to you that the evidence is just plain inconsistent and refutes that statement. The prosecution's own witnesses, everything that they testified to just about is

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consistent with the defense's not only theory, but facts of what occurred in this case.

Trooper Myers got on the stand. He told you where this took place, out on the US Steel property. What's out there? Thousands of acres of woods, no houses, amusement parks, no nothing like that. What do people do out there? They hunt. What was the defendant wearing? He was wearing camouflage hunting clothing. Did the defendant have his hunting license with him? Yes, he did. What kind of boots was he wearing? He was wearing hunting boots. What did the defendant tell Trooper Myers? He said he was out hunting, I was out target practicing.

Trooper Marino testified to the same thing. told you that the defendant told him what he was doing, using the guns while hunting, while target practicing. The officer from the Game Commission also told you the same thing. So I suggest that the prosecution's case is entirely consistent with the defendant's case, that the objective evidence presented by the prosecution proves that the defendant was indeed hunting and/or target practicing at the time that this occurred. Moreover, these facts were confirmed by the defendant's witnesses.

We brought in people that know Mr. Leuschen,

either personally or through profession. The profession being the man, Mr. Seaman, that owned Elk Creek Sports Store. Mr. Seaman told you that Mr. Leuschen is one of his regular customers, he comes in throughout the year. He's an avid sportsman. He buys targets, he buys ammunition, he buys guns, he buys fishing equipment. You also heard from our other defense witnesses who have been out hunting with Mr. Leuschen, hunting that area, hunting in other areas. They told you about his past experiences and the fact that he is indeed an avid sportsman.

The defendant also -- he didn't have to take the stand, although we are in the other courtroom, he didn't have to take the stand and testify on his own behalf, but he did -- he wanted to. He wanted to tell you what happened, what his side of the story was. You saw him, you observed him and I believe that you observed him to be a credible, believable and truthful witness. Why did I think you reached those conclusions? Because that is the impression that he can make. And why did he convey that impression, simply because he was speaking the truth.

Ladies and gentlemen, just ten days ago we celebrated the 4th of July. And today, all in the history of free society and a free world, somewhat free

world, is an important day, and that's Bastille Day and all of France is celebrating it today. And today is the bicentennial, the 200th Anniversary of the storming of the gates at the Bastille Prison where thousands of political prisonors were freed. They were fortunate enough to be let loose prior to being executed by the quillotine as twenty thousand people were before them.

And both the 4th of July and Bastille Day are great celebrations of freedom and great celebrations of world liberty they are remembered with parades and picnics and fireworks. And the American Revolution lead to the Bill of Rights, the French Revolution lead to the Rights of Man. Both of these documents are tremendous keystones to the world of democracy, of freedom. Both of these documents are simply paper upon which words have been written, they have no ability to act, no ability to do anything other than influence. In other words, unless put to action, those documents, those words are worthless.

So the final thought that I'm going to leave with you today is this, it's one of courage. Mr. Zak promised you in his opening statement, he said, I promise we will prove beyond a reasonable doubt Mr. Leuschen's guilt, and I suggest to you that the prosecution has not in any way delivered on their

promise. Have the courage to tell the Government no.

Stand up and say this is not what America stands for and we will not stand for it today in this courtroom.

And while we can't bring back to life the thousands of people who died in the American Revolution, in the French Revolution, all the great heroes and patriots who have come since then, we can honor or cherish their memory today in this courtroom when you return a verdict of not guilty on all counts. Thank you very much.

MR. ZAK: May it please the Court, Mr. D'Alba, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. You just heard the remarks of defense counsel as to why he's arguing to you that his client should be found not guilty. I'm not sure it's for you to decide whether, after all of his remarks, any of us are any of the wiser. What I'm doing is speaking to you and this is the last time I'll be speaking to you. And the prosecution goes last in a criminal case because we have the burden of proof. We are the ones who brought these charges, we are the ones who have to prove them to your satisfaction, and I can't overemphasize that.

Now, Mr. D'Alba made some very interesting references to history. Today is Bastille Day, and we recently celebrated the 4th of July. I think we all

know what that means. But what both of those events did, they created Governments of the people, represented by France's National Assembly and our Government, by the consent of us. And our representative as we elected based on our Pennsylvania Constitution, which was influenced by these events, that in our revolution, as well as the French Revolution, our representative is in the interest of public safety. And that's why we have Governments, that's why we have democracy and republic conformance of Government. They enacted some laws for the interest of public safety.

One of them is the Uniform Firearms Act, which is why we are here today and yesterday and the day before, and that's why you, ladies and gentlemen, were taken away from your homes and your jobs and your other interests to come into this courtroom and listen to all of this and to consider all of this and deliberate on it as you will do in a few minutes, that's why we are here. Because one of your fellow citizens — and we are all equal citizens — is here accused, and you as peers have to determine whether or not dispassionately and honestly whether he violated those laws enacted by our fairly elected representatives with the consent of all of us.

Now, the District Attorney's office in Erie County and the State Police and the State Game Commission are not in the business of harassing citizens and persecuting citizens. And we are not in the business of asking our fellow citizens you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, to join in anything of that type, that's not what this is about. This isn't some question of a Mickey Mouse type of a Government regulation.

You heard a lot about hunting rules and you heard a lot about firearms rules and a lot about firearms, what type of firearms are proper and what type aren't. Well, those are important things, very important of substance not only to the law intellectually, but more importantly, to our lives. I don't have to draw a picture on that easel over there as to the type of damage, the type of pain, the type of tragedy that can result from the improper use of firearms, that's why we have firearms laws in Pennsylvania.

In the Pennsylvania Constitution and the US

Constitution, we have the right to keep and bear arms;

but like all rights in the Constitution, such as the

right to free speech, you don't have a right to scream

fire in a crowded theater. There are qualifications

based on common sense; and you all brought your common

sense here, you didn't leave it at home this morning.

And common sense says that while a citizen who qualifies can own what the law calls a firearm and has a right to have that firearm, he does not have a right to have it and use it under all conditions, all circumstances. You have come way beyond the days of Dodge City in our society. Those days are gone, may they never return. We have a civilized society or we'd like to think so, and we want to make it more civilized.

So we said, yes, you buy a handgun, you prove that you're a person who can receive the handgun, you give us the proper identification, you register it, you are allowed to keep it in your home, in your fixed place of business. You're allowed to target shoot with it, you're allowed to take it to a gunsmith, you're allowed to take it with you when you move, you're allowed to take it hunting, if it is suitable for hunting. You're allowed to do all those things, but you're not allowed to load it up and carry it on your person just because you feel like it or you think it's neat to carry a gun or because of some speculation you may encounter some animal you may want to shoot or because it's just your thing. No, you can't do that and you shouldn't do that, that's why we have these laws.

And if you want to carry a weapon for a good

reason like self-protection or your job requires it, and some of us are in that situation, then you do it the right way. You make application of the proper authorities, you prove yourself a suitable American and you justify it. Yes, I have a reason, it's part of my job, I have got to carry a lot of money; it's part of my job, I have to protect people, I have to protect myself. There are a lot of reasons. You have to give a good reason not just because, hey, I think guns are neat, that's not good enough. And that's only right and fair, and we went over some of those points in jury selection, and we discussed that and I say that very candidly.

Now, all the prosecution has to prove in this case are three basic elements. And I suggest to you and I argue to you, there is no question we proved them all beyond a reasonable doubt. Number one, that Mr. Leuschen was in possession of three firearms and the Judge will define what a firearm is, pistol, revolver or with a barrel less than 12 inches, shotgun with a barrel less than 24 inches, rifle less than 16 inches.

Now, we have three guns here and they all qualify as, quote, firearms. We have a .357 magnum revolver, holds six shots. It was recovered loaded from the defendant. It says an eight inch barrel, you can check

that if you like, that's within the rule or beyond the rule, however one interprets it. The .22 caliber revolver, also six shots, was recovered fully loaded from the defendant. And he admits that he was carrying it the day in question. It was in his car, loaded. And lastly, we have a 9mm semiautomatic pistol, 15 round clip. This is in evidence. Two clips, one in the box it came in and one was loaded in the weapon. Fifteen rounds, there is a little counter here. You can count fifteen, you can look inside and see how many you have. 9mm Luger ammunition, copper coated bullet, fifteen rounds each. This man had fire power with that one weapon of 30 rounds, 30 shots. And those of you who may be in the service may be familiar with pistols, plus one in the chamber.

MR. D'ALBA: Excuse me, this is a semiautomatic pistol?

MR. ZAK: It's the expression. Semiautomatic pistols are often referred to as automatic pistols. One shot each, press of the trigger until it's empty; put in another clip, slide those forward, fifteen more shots. What was he hunting? What was he hunting with that? What was the purpose? Why? It's a weapon you could infer that's designed to be used against a target that's shooting back, it's not a sporting weapon. He

1	
1	has a right to own it, but he doesn't have a right to
2	carry it into the hunting fields. This man testified
3	that he's been a hunter since he was eight or nine
4	years old in the State of Pennsylvania. State of
5	Pennsylvania you can't carry a semiautomatic pistol in
6	the hunting fields for hunting, you can't do that.
7	MR. D'ALBA: Excuse me, Mr. Zak, I do hate to
8	interrupt during a closing, but I believe that's
9	incorrect.
10	THE COURT: Address the Court, please.
11	MR. ZAK: That's a thoroughly correct statement.
12	THE COURT: Let's do it at sidebar. Excuse us
13	just a minute.
14	(Whereupon, the following discussion occurred
15	on the record at sidebar:)
16	THE COURT: Go ahead, Jay.
17	MR. D'ALBA: Judge, he's telling the jury you
18	can't carry a semiautomatic pistol while you're
19	hunting, and I believe the judge is going to instruct
20	the jury to the contrary that you can.
21	MR. ZAK: No, you can't.
22	THE COURT: Carry.
23	MR. D'ALBA: You can't.
24	THE COURT: Are you talking about the difference
25	between carrying and using?

MR. D'ALBA: He's saying you can't carry it, you can't use it legally, but you sure can carry it and I'd like the jury to be -- that to be rectified to the jury, he's misleading the jury. THE COURT: Can we solve this problem by you

saying instead of carry, you mean to say you can't use it during hunting.

MR. ZAK: That's what I meant.

THE COURT: I realize --

MR. ZAK: See, what he's doing, he's taking that out of context because in the context of the sentence before that --

THE COURT: But here's the thing, it's not a violation of the hunting laws to carry it, it's a violation to use it. I think we ought to straighten that up.

MR. ZAK: Fine.

THE COURT: I mean, that will get you the same point. Are you going to do that? Why don't you do it rather than me?

MR. ZAK: I'll do that.

(Whereupon, discussion at sidebar was concluded.) MR. ZAK: In Pennsylvania, you can't hunt, shoot game with a semiautomatic pistol. So the defendant

tells you he did that, he was carrying this pistol for

25

23 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

purposes of hunting, he's not being very straightforward and honest with you as Mr. D'Alba wants you to believe, because he can't do it for hunting purposes, for purposes of shooting game.

The defendant was also carrying a rifle. Now, the rifle is not for your consideration, but in determining credibility in this case, you should be aware of this rifle. This is for the part of the case that the judge only will decide, the hunting -- the game violations. This is a rifle, as you all will see, with a large telescopic sight on it. It sits up pretty high. As you'll note, there is sights, you can see through here. And as the trooopers testified, it's in evidence with a full clip, three rounds in the clip. .243 Winchester = ammunition, high-powered rifle, slide action, and he had it over his shoulder on a sling, we have to infer, and was carrying it in his hands. And as he testified, what was he doing with it? He had a pistol in one pocket, another one in another pocket, plus this. Speaking of revolution, sounds like something out of a Pancho Villa movie, ladies and gentlemen. sportsman, it's like we are persecuting poor Huckleberry Finn, nature-loving free spirit.

In February, he's going after the big bad woodchucks who were probably hibernating. What's out

there? What game is out there? We heard the game proctor, our witness, we heard even witnesses of the defendant, his own brother, when you shoot woodchucks, you shoot them over open country. And when they went out woodchuck shooting, that's where they went. The guy who runs the gun store, he agreed with us on that — excuse me, the prosecution on that. You don't do it in the woods.

And then the defendant tells us, well, he was out there, one of the things he wanted to do was sight in that rifle, and he had targets, hundred yard targets. Doesn't it make sense that when you want to sight in a rifle -- these are inferences you can draw from the evidence -- you have a target that's set up for a hundred yards, you go to a place, an open place where you knew that you had a hundred yards. How else can you adjust that telescopic sight? You don't go in the woods full of trees and foliage, you go to a rifle range where it says a hundred yards, two hundred yards, three hundred yards. He's going out there to sight it He's given us every possible excuse that he can think of why he was out there messing with these guns. Well, I was fishing; well, I was hunting; well, I was target shooting; oh, my doctor said I should walk because I have a problem with my knee. Well, if you

1

2

3

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

want to take a walk, you don't have to go out in the boondocks and carry a bunch of guns around with you unless you're back in boot camp. There is no reason for it.

There is no hunting season except for fox. These weapons are not suitable for fox, it's not a season. Crow, where are the crows? They are in Florida or perhaps all of us should have been. And where is the woodchucks? Most likely hibernating. And as the witness has said, it's unlikely you're going to see it, unlikely you're going to see it. So what's the point of going to those pains, what was he doing there? Now, we don't have to prove what he was doing, but we do have to prove that he didn't have a right to be carrying these weapons at that time. Now, any legitimate hunter should know -- and this man had the little hunting handbook, he had a hunting license, he'd been hunting for years. Common sense tells us, and the law tells us that whether you're hunting or not, you don't put a loaded weapon in your car, it's a violation. He was cited for that and the judge will consider that.

Well, when the trooper approached him and started questioning him, it turns out everything in his car that's in evidence here was loaded, three guns fully

loaded, a rifle fully loaded. So if he's been hunting and he was just a simple hunter, why would he be carrying fully loaded weapons? And as the trooper testified on rebuttal this morning, the man's car door was closed, the engine was running. Leads you to infer this man either just pulled over after driving in the car with loaded weapons or was about to drive away with loaded weapons. Are those the actions of just the guys out there hunting, enjoying the great outdoors by Walden Pond? No, no, it wasn't. And it's interesting using the name of Henry David Thoreau as sort of a historical character, a man of peace and civil disobedience in support of someone carrying a high powered military pistol, but we will let that go.

Now, the defendant was not all that candid with you. True, he does not have the burden of proof, but you've got to consider his credibility. And the judge will tell you he is an interested witness in this case, he has a stake in what happens here. He's the guest of honor, the guy on trial. He differed with what those state trooopers had to say. He says, oh, I showed them targets, I had a red hat. They told us, hey, no targets, no red hat. He didn't tell us where he was shooting or what he was doing. He says, oh, yeah, target shooting, hunting, generalities, handy

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

generalities. Did he back that up? Did he? And he agreed to talk to those trooopers, he talked to Trooper Myers. He wasn't under arrest for a darn thing at thatpoint. Trooper Myers didn't have to give him any rights, didn't have to do anything, they were just talking.

When he was in court, Trooper Marino -- at the station, Trooper Marino give him his Miranda rights, told him his Constitutional rights. He agreed to talk. What did he say? I was out hunting, hunting. Where? For what? With what? Very quiet now. What a person doesn't say is just as important, if not more important than what they do say. He agreed to talk. And what did he do? He didn't do very well for himself. And then when he's taken away afterwards, after he's arrested, he makes a scene in the back of the police Is that the action of a guy who just simply is charged with just some Mickey Mouse violations, technicalities that he's innocent of? Are those the actions of a person who is conscious of guilt? Who He's caught with a big, big no-no know, a knows. violation of the criminal law, that the police caught him, and he did not want to be caught doing something he wouldn't want to be caught doing.

Now, Mr. Leuschen says, well, I have a hunting

21

22

23

24

25

1

license; in fact, it's in evidence. Well, he said when he got back to his car after hunting, he took the license off, and it's in evidence. The license is worn on the back of your jacket, and he had a zip-up coverall. So what that would mean, logically, if you want to take something off your jacket that's pinned on -- or off your clothes that's pinned on it, you'd have to take the whole darn thing off and take it off. For what purpose? Why is it so important to take his hunting license off the back of his jacket at that point if it were on, if it were on? Why would it be so important to take his red hat off immediately if it were there, if it were there? And the red hat sort of clashes, no pun intended, with the camouflage outfit which is designed so you don't see him, that's why camouflage was invented. Doesn't seem to make a whole lot of sense here. The trooper searched the car, no red hat came to their attention. The defendant brought no red hats to his attention and he's the guy who's asserting, hey, I'm a hunter.

Fishing, he talked about fishing. Defendant's Exhibit B, you'll have a Xerox of the hunting license and two Xeroxes of his provisional firearms license for the .357 Magnum and the .22 pistol. Well, those aren't too readable, so we supplied you with the originals of

those licenses from the courthouse records. And you'll note, date of issue, 12-9-88 on both of them, and just below it, hunting/fishing license number, and they are the same license number. You don't see a fishing license number there because fishing is crossed out on both of those. Only hunting is indicated there, fishing is crossed out.

MR. D'ALBA: Excuse me, Your Honor, again the — Commonwealth stipulated that the man possessd a proper fishing license.

MR. ZAK: That's right. But nevertheless, you will note that fishing is crossed out by somebody and you can make certain an inference from that that perhaps these guns do not apply to fishing.

Now, the defense would want you to believe that a person can just carry one of these weapons with them while they are hunting or fishing, and perhaps not even with the intention of shooting game, just carrying that for some — whatever reason. But the law does provide, and the Judge will instruct you on this, that in order to carry such a weapon for those purposes, even if those were the purposes, and we don't concede that, there has to be one of those little licenses that I just showed you. Well, he had licenses of that type, and those are very limited, for the .22 revolver and

the .357 revolver. But he has no license of any sort, whatsoever, for the 9mm, so there is no way he's not — he can be not guilty on the 9mm, no way. He had no provisional license for hunting or fishing with it, he fit into none of the exceptions here, he couldn't use it for hunting.

MR. D'ALBA: Excuse me, Your Honor, but it does fit the exception for target practicing for official license required.

MR. ZAK: Your Honor, I can't tolerate this. This man has argued --

THE COURT: Let's do it at sidebar fellows, come up here.

(Whereupon, the following discussion occurred on the record at sidebar:)

THE COURT: I'm going to instruct them and explain the difference between the two exceptions, and I think I ought to do that now to clarify that.

MR. ZAK: Well, I'd like to continue my argument, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I just want to instruct them.

MR. ZAK: This is a tactical move to interrupt my argument.

MR. D'ALBA: You're misstating the law. The Judge is telling you you are wrong.

MR. ZAK: I did not misstate any law.

THE COURT: I'm going to instruct them to get them on the right track, then I can --

MR. ZAK: I stated it just the way you instructed me to state it.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

(Whereupon, discussion at sidebar was concluded.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I just want to clear up a point at this time. When counsel is finished, I will instruct you on the law. And during the course of the trial, there are two possible exceptions that have been referred to. District Attorney Zak is talking about one of them now and Attorney D'Alba has been talking about the other. When they finish, I will try to clarify them so that you'll have a better understanding of which exception, if any, applies.

You may continue.

MR. ZAK: Thank you, Your Honor. Any discussion, any statement along that line that Mr. D'Alba has made in this case concerning the law or I have made concerning the law, you're to be guided by what the Judge says the law is and what it isn't. Although I do not believe that any misstatements of the law have been made, at least from this side of this case.

Now, there is no way, as I stated before, that the defendant can be found not guilty consistent with your oath of jurors on the 9mm. As for the .22 and the .357, you have to decide, and the Judge will instruct you, you have to decide if he actually was hunting or target shooting with those weapons, and if he actually was coming to and from hunting or target shooting. That's only if you decide if he was hunting and/or target shooting or coming to and from. The Judge will read you the very narrow exception on the law on that, and I am confident that when you hear what the Judge has to say on that, you cannot find him not guilty, you'll have to find him guilty on that, just on the basis of law and the facts.

Now, the defendant throughout this case, throughout his testimony, was less than candid. I asked him on cross-examination, at one point, his address. Simple question, what is your address. His answer, 257 West 21st Street, Erie, Pennsylvania.

Okay. Well, you'll take a look at this, it's going to go out with you, these firearms licenses dated 12-9-88, the provisional ones for hunting, 2815 Homer Avenue, Erie, Pennsylvania. Different address. On rebuttal, we established that he told Trooper Myers that he was living out of his car at the time and then we have him

also giving the Homer address to the trooopers one time. Why have we got different addresses here, living out of the car, Homer Avenue, West 21st Street, what's the problem? Can't the guy get his address straight?

And then he was all in a lather, all upset, this trooper was too interested in him. Here's a trooper that's worked for over 20 years, mostly in this county, in the west county. He patrols that area, he personally hunts that area, he knows that area, he's a sworn officer of the law and an experienced officer of the law, and he was doing just what we pay him to do. He sees a vehicle on the side of the road, driver with his head down, alone, then turns out there is out of state plates, out of state. No less, he wouldn't be doing his job, it would be shame on him if he didn't stop and start asking questions.

Now, what does he see? That rifle in the front seat. Let's get out of the car, let's talk. And one thing leads to another. It's like those clown tricks when one handkerchief after another comes out of the hat; one gun after another and loads of ammunition, regular ammunition, hollow-point ammunition, all kinds of ammunition comes out. Something is wrong. And then this guy is getting nervous and frustrated acting, hey you're raining on my parade, Mr. Policeman.

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The policeman didn't arrest him then, not because the defendant was not guilty, not because he didn't have a darn good case at that point, but the officer explained it. I didn't arrest him for a very simple reason. I know enough that I'm not going to go one-on-one against a guy, and I don't know what he's got. I patted him around his waist as best as I could. The defendant denies that. Who knows why he denies I'm away from my radio, I'm away from my car, I'm working alone, I can't turn my back on this guy, so it's the next best thing. I have got his guns, he certainly wants his guns back. I'll take his guns and we will go to the station. And it doesn't matter a whole lot who drove first or who drove last, it's better the defendant drove first so the trooper can watch him better.

And the trooper gets on the radio to get to the station, his coworkers, fellow trooopers come out. Situation is hand-in-hand. They walk the man in, they get a statement, they charge him, they do things in the proper, civilized manner. Nobody gets hurt and everyone's rights are protected, including Trooper Myers' rights. So that's no evidence against the Commonwealth, that doesn't mean he was not guilty just because he wasn't arrested on the spot. In fact, it

indicates the -- of course, it supports Trooper Myers' suspicion and his actions, based on his years of experience and his good sound judgment, acting in the public safety as a police officer.

Now, the Judge is going to instruct you on reasonable doubt. Mr. D'Alba referred to reasonable doubt. You can't find the defendant guilty unless you find him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Now, that doesn't mean all doubt, that just means the kind of doubt that restrains a reasonable person acting in that great importance to himself. Well, a lot of wise people think hey, maybe there is a little doubt about everything, but we are not here to discuss philosophy. We don't have to prove this case to a mathematical certainty, we don't have to eliminate all possibilities of innocence. We have to prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt.

I suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen, this case has been proven well, well, far beyond a reasonable doubt. And we are here, you know, and as I began, we are here in the interest of not giving the defendant a hard time, we are here in the interest of public safety, public order, responsibility and of sanity. That's why we are here, and that's why this prosecution was instituted, that's why we are pursuing it. And we

are asking you to agree with us, go to that jury room, consider the evidence impartially and render a proper verdict. And don't concern yourself, as the judge told you, with extraneous matters. Penalty is irrelevant, the judge will decide that. The issue is you have got to call them as you see them, call them as you see them.

Tell Mr. Leuschen no, we are representatives of the community, we are your peers, we have considered it. You have had your day in court, you have had your fair trial, I'm sorry, but you're guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Zak.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, it's a fundamental principal of our system of criminal law that every defendant, including Douglas Burton

Leuschen, is presumed innocent. Therefore, the mere fact that he was arrested and is accused of this crime and is on trial is not evidence against him.

Furthermore, Mr. Leuschen, as you have heard everybody tell you, is presumed innocent throughout this whole trial, unless and until you can conclude, based on your careful and impartial consideration of the evidence, that the Commonwealth has proven Mr. Leuschen guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

It is not Mr. Leuschen's burden to prove that he

is not guilty. In criminal law, it works the other way. It's the Commonwealth who always has the burden of proving each and every element of this crime. And shortly, I'm going to tell you what those are. And they have to prove that Mr. Leuschen is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and that all of those elements are present.

Now, Mr. Leuschen is accused of a crime, he's not required to present any evidence or prove anything in his own defense. If the Commonwealth has failed to carry their burden, then your verdict must be not guilty. On the other hand, if you conclude that the Commonwealth's evidence does prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Leuschen is guilty, then your verdict should be guilty. Although the Commonwealth is the moving party and it's their job to prove Mr. Leuschen guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, that doesn't mean that they have to prove that case beyond all doubt and it doesn't have to be a mathematical certainty, nor must it demonstrate the complete impossibility of innocence.

A reasonable doubt, as the name implies, is a doubt that's based on reason, a doubt for which you can give a reason. It is such a doubt as would cause one of you, ladies and gentlemen, after your careful and

candid and impartial consideration of all of the evidence, to be so undecided that you cannot say that you have a deep-routed belief in Mr. Leuschen's guilt. It is such a doubt as would cause a reasonable, a careful and sensitive person, to hesitate or pause in the more important affairs of life.

Now, it's difficult to put your finger on a reasonable doubt, and you're going to have to make that determination yourself based on everything you have heard at this trial. Now, that reasonable doubt must fairly arise out of the evidence that was presented or out of the lack of some evidence that was not presented with regard to some element of the crime. A reasonable doubt must be a real doubt. You must not imagine that there is a doubt, nor should you manufacture or make up a doubt to avoid carrying out an unpleasant duty. So, to summarize, you may not find Mr. Leuschen quilty based on a mere suspicion of guilt. The Commonwealth has the burden of proving Mr. Leuschen guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. If the Commonwealth meets that burden, then Mr. Leuschen is no longer presumed innocent and you should find him guilty. On the other hand, if the Commonwealth does not meet its burden, then you must find him quilty -- I'm sorry, you must find him not guilty if the Commonwealth has not met

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

their burden.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the charges against Mr.

Leuschen start out basically simple. But there are

some exceptions, and that's what gets a little bit

complicated. Now, I'm first going to tell you the

basic charge. The statute states no person shall carry

a firearm in any vehicle or concealed on or about his

person except in his place of abode or fixed place of

business without a license. Now, that's the charge.

Now, Mr. Leuschen is charged three times because there are three revolvers, and he has one charge relating to each of those three revolvers. elements in that crime are as follows. In order to find the defendant guilty of having firearms without a license, these elements must be present: First, you have to decide that the defendant carried a firearm in a vehicle or concealed about his person. I'm not going to comment on these as to whether or not those elements have been met, that's your job. The second element that you have to consider is that the firearm was in operating condition, and that's a required element of this crime. The third element is that the defendant was not in his place of abode or his fixed place of business. And the fourth thing you have to consider is whether or not the defendant had a license for carrying the pistol.

Now, assuming you decide as to each of the three pistols that those four elements have been met, then I guess it would make sense to see if there are any exceptions that would be pertinent to allow you to find the defendant not guilty.

Now, there are two different exceptions; there are a number, but there are only two that are germane to what we are doing, and I'm going to read them from the statute. Now, the statute that I just read, the crime Mr. Leuschen is charged with, states that if Mr. Leuschen would meet one of these exceptions, then it would be an excuse and he would not be guilty.

Now, the first exception states this, and these are people who are allowed to violate the section: The members of any organization incorporated under the laws of this Commonwealth engaged in target shooting with rifle, pistol or revolver, if such members are at or are going to or from the places of assembly or target practice. Now, with regard to the weapons, if you would find that Mr. Leuschen would qualify under this exception, then you must acquit him of that charge.

Now, there is a second exception, and this one is even more complicated because there are two parts to it. Let me explain it by reading. Another exception,

that's a person who is allowed to violate this section, is as follows: Persons licensed to hunt, if such persons are actually hunting or are going to the places where they desire to hunt or returning from such places. Now, that's the exception, but it doesn't stop there, that's qualified, and the qualification is as follows: To qualify for the hunting exception, as I will refer to it, such person shall, at the time of securing his hunting or fishing or any time after he's acquired those licenses, register with the County Treasurer the make of the firearm he desires to carry and the caliber and number thereof on a form that's provided by the Pennsylvania State Police.

Now, to try to paraphrase that, it reads this way:

If you decide Mr. Leuschen has met the four elements so
that he would be guilty as charged, then you have to
see if either of the exceptions apply; you only need
one of them. If the exception you're looking at is the
one that deals with the hunting, if he's going hunting,
it's an exception, there is a qualification to that.
And that qualification states that if you're going to
use the hunting exception, you have to, before that
exception can be granted, qualify by registering with
the County Treasurer. Now, that's a little bit
complicated, but that will be for you jurors to decide.

:0

Now, I want to say one more comment. You have heard testimony and argument as to the involvement of the semiautomatic pistol that's the subject of one of the charges. Now, I think a correct statement of law is that if you would hunt with that semiautomatic pistol, it would be a violation of the game law. But what I want to tell you is if you believe that exception, the hunting exception has been met, and that the condition for meeting that exception is to register that weapon in the County Treasurer's office, you can find that Mr. Leuschen is not guilty of the charge involving the 9mm pistol, even though it would be an illegal weapon to hunt with.

Now, that's a little more complicated than normal, but I think we can handle it from there. Now, those are the elements of the crime, and as I indicated to you, there are four charges. You will decide three of them and I will decide the one that's the game law violation at some time later.

Now, before you retire to decide this case, I would like to provide you with some final guidelines for the way in which you conduct your deliberations and how you properly arrive at a verdict. Now, it's my responsibility to decide all the questions of law, and you must accept and follow my rulings and instructions

on those matters I have just told you about that tell you what the law says and how it must be applied. I am not the judge of the facts. If one person said yes and another said no, it's up to you to decide which to believe if you cannot reconcile the two sides. It's not up to me to decide the facts involving the charges against Mr. Leuschen. You, the jurors, are the sole judges of those facts. It's your responsibility to consider the evidence, to find the facts and apply the law to the facts as you find them to decide whether or not Mr. Leuschen is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Your decision in this case is of considerable importance. It's your responsibility as jurors to perform your duties and reach a verdict based on only the evidence that was presented in this trial.

Now, in deciding the facts that you may choose to believe, what you choose not to believe, I would expect you to use your common sense and your everyday practical knowledge of life as you have experienced it. Your deliberations should be free of any bias or prejudice. Both the Commonwealth and Mr. Leuschen have a right to expect you to consider the evidence conscientiously and apply the law as I have just outlined it to you.

Now, in arriving at a verdict, you should not

consider yourself whatsoever with any future possible consequences of your verdict, including what the penalty might be if you choose to find the defendant guilty. The question of guilt and the question of penalty are decided separately.

Now, because this is a criminal matter, we will have twelve jurors deliberating, and your verdict must be unanimous. That means before you can end up with a verdict, each of you must agree to it. You have a duty to consult with each other and to deliberate as you best see fit to try to reach an agreement if it can be possibly done. Now, each of you must make your own determination, but only after you have considered what others might want to discuss concerning this matter. In the course of your deliberations, you should not be shy and if you have an opinion that's an honest opinion, you ought to voice it.

Now, when you leave, the first thing you should do is to select one of your members as what used to be called a foreman, we now call it the foreperson. One of the responsibilities of that foreman or forewoman is to see that the decision is deliberated in a fair manner. That person should make sure that anybody that wants to express an opinion has proper and ample time to do that.

Now, when you leave to go to the jury room, you will be given certain exhibits. Now, in this case we have had a number of exhibits presented and I have met with the attorneys and we have decided that you can take most of them. But because some of those are firearms and ammunition, we don't want any accidents, so we are not going to allow any ammunition out of the room. You will have the three weapons, the three handguns that have previously been identified, plus most of everything else. You will not be given any written statements of any of the witnesses. Please don't ask for them because if I had them, I couldn't give them to you.

Now, when you leave, you will have this envelope. In this envelope, there are three pieces of paper that we call a verdict slip. They are very basic, there is one verdict slip for each of the three charges and it states how you find the defendant, either guilty or not guilty. Once you have reached a conclusion on each of the three charges, the foreman completes this by saying guilty or not guilty, he dates it July 14, he signs the form, that's how we will ultimately know what the conclusion is.

Now, after you have finished deliberating, you should knock on the door and advise the tipstaff, there

will be one with you at all times -- not in your deliberating room, but in the vicinity -- to help you if she can. When you reach a decision, you notify her. Please do not tell her what it is, we only want to know, yes, we have a verdict or no, we don't. When we know that you have a verdict, we will reassemble right in this room. It will take a little time to get the attorneys and Mr. Leuschen and the court personnel available. We will meet in open court. At that time, I will ask the foreman if he has reached a verdict. I will check to see that it's in proper form and then that verdict will be announced in the open courtroom.

Now, gentlemen, is there anything else?

MR. D'ALBA: No, Your Honor.

MR. ZAK: No, we have nothing further.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Whereupon, the Tipstaves were sworn.)

THE COURT: You may take the jury. Would the alternate juror please stay in his place, please.

(Whereupon, the jury began their deliberations at 2:38 p.m.)

THE COURT: Mr. Meely, you're the only alternate juror we have left. And at this time we have -- at this point we have to dismiss you from your responsibilities, and it's unfortunate you cannot

participate in the deliberations in that you have been here for three days, but I want to tell you we really appreciate your time and your dedication. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the alternate juror was dismissed.)

THE COURT: Mr. Leuschen, you have been charged

with four charges. The jury is deliberating on the

first three to make a decision. The fourth charge is a

violation of the Game Act and it's a summary offense

and it's my job to determine that.

Now, the elements of that crime are -- I will read it to you, it is unlawful for a person to have a firearm of any kind in a conveyance propelled by mechanical power, which would qualify as your truck, and the testimony that I have heard is that you had a loaded rifle in that vehicle. So it is my determination that you are guilty as of that charge as you have been charged.

Now, that is, according to our statute, a summary of the fifth degree and the penalty for that that I impose herewith is a \$100 fine and costs, and I will give you 30 days from today to attend to the payment of those.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor, thank you.

It was a car, sir, not a truck.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you.

MR. ZAK: I don't know how long the jury will be out, but we are inquiring -- we were just inquiring about the -- in the event of a question, I want to talk about that to the trooper concerned about it because it's his -- we have an evidence locker in the DA's office and I just want -- I just didn't want to leave it unattended.

THE COURT: We are going to tend to it right next.

MR. ZAK: Because I had a gun case the last term,

the jury had to come back the next day, they were deadlocked and there was some juggling around with that

stuff.

THE COURT: We are going to tend to it as soon as our defendant is on his way back. As soon as he leaves, I want to talk to the trooper about how to secure that.

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: I'm concerned about the weapons in the courtroom. Now, first the rifle we don't even need, so

that can be --

TROOPER MYERS: I can take that back.

THE COURT: I don't know. He has an appeal period, so I wouldn't dispose of it until you are beyond that.

MR. ZAK: We'll maintain it.

THE COURT: But we can move it out of here now. I have instructed the tipstaffs to leave the pistols in that room.

(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)

(Whereupon, the jury returned at 3:45 p.m. with a question.)

THE COURT: Sir, are you the jury foreman?
THE FOREMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I received a question that was submitted by you from your jury, and I wasn't quite sure of what you were asking, so I ask that you rephrase it. Now, I want to tell you what I think you have asked me, and I just want you to tell me if I understand your question. Do you want to know if an element of this crime requires the firearm to be loaded or not loaded, is that your question?

THE FOREMAN: That's one of them.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me respond to that one. Now, in my charge, I read what the crime is stated in our statute, and I broke it down into four elements. Now, the elements that you must find present to determine a guilty conclusion is that the defendant carried a firearm. It doesn't describe whether or not

it be loaded. And also, that the firearm was in operating condition. So there is nothing in any of the elements that requires the weapon to be loaded or identifies it as unloaded. So my conclusion to that question is that the crime elements can be met, whether the weapon is loaded or not loaded. Does that answer that question?

THE FOREMAN: Your Honor, now --

THE COURT: Now, I don't want to discuss it now, but --

THE FOREMAN: There is no discussion with that, we are having trouble with the license.

THE COURT: Well, if you could frame a question pertaining to the license, I must meet with the attorneys to determine how to respond to it. So, if you would -- if you have a question, you can sit right there and write it for us and we will try to do it here while we are present. Do you want to do that? But I really don't want to discuss it. I'd like to limit it to a question and an answer. Then, gentlemen, when we get the question, we will look at it here and see how you suggest we answer it.

(Whereupon, a brief discussion was held off the record.)

THE COURT: We understand that, we are going to

draft an answer for you.

THE FOREMAN: All right.

THE COURT: The second question I have been submitted is you want to know the difference between a provisional license and a permit. Now, a permit is something that a person applies to that allows — or applies for that allows that person to carry a weapon. And if we had a permit in this case, there would not be any charge. A provisional license applies only to the hunting exception that I had told you about in my charge. And if you have a provisional permit, you're allowed to have a weapon on the way to hunting and on the way home. The permit is much broader and allows you to have a concealed weapon, period. Does that answer your question?

THE FOREMAN: Yes, Your Honor, it does. Are we now ready to continue to deliberate? I think so. I thank you.

(Whereupon, the jury recessed to continue their deliberations at 3:52 p.m.)

(Whereupon, the jury returned with their verdict at 4:07 p.m.)

(Whereupon, during the verdict proceedings, Attorney John J. Trucilla appeared on behalf of the Commonwealth.)

THE TIPSTAFF: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, have you agreed upon a verdict?

THE FOREMAN: We have.

THE TIPSTAFF: As to your verdict in the issue joined between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Douglas Burton Leuschen, you say you find the defendant, Douglas Burton Leuschen, guilty of Count 1, that's the 9mm semiautomatic charge; so say you all?

(Whereupon, the jurors respond affirmatively.)

THE TIPSTAFF: Count 2, the .357 revolver charge, you say you find the defendant, Douglas Burton Leuschen not guilty, so say you all?

(Whereupon, the jurors respond affirmatively.)

THE TIPSTAFF: Count 3, the .22 caliber revolver, you say you find the defendant, Douglas Burton Leuschen, not guilty, so say you all?

(Whereupon, the jurors respond affirmatively.)

THE COURT: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Now your job is concluded and I appreciate and we all in the court system appreciate very much the time and the devotion and the effort, and at this time I excuse you from your duties.

MR. D'ALBA: Excuse me, Your Honor, before you do that, may we approach the bench briefly?

(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the

record.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as I indicated to you, your verdict has to be unanimous, so the attorneys are allowed to ask you individually what your verdicts are. And when your number is called by our tipstaff, I would appreciate it if you would respond and we will do that three different times, one on each of the charges. Now, that's called polling the jury and I'm first going to poll you on Charge Number 696 and that is the charge involving the 9mm semiautomatic rifle, and the jury slip I have shows that you determined that Mr. Leuschen is guilty of that charge. Now, that's the only one we are going to talk about for now.

THE TIPSTAFF: Juror 160, would you please stand and give your verdict and remain standing.

JUROR NO. 160: Guilty.

THE TIPSTAFF: Number 550?

JUROR NO. 550: Guilty.

THE TIPSTAFF: In place of our juror who is ill,

Juror 632?

JUROR NO. 632: Guilty.

THE TIPSTAFF: 252?

JUROR NO. 252: Guilty.

THE TIPSTAFF: 421, this would be Andrew Lucas?

1	JUROR NO. 421: Guilty
2	THE TIPSTAFF: 233?
3	JUROR NO. 233: Guilty.
4	THE TIPSTAFF: 230?
5	JUROR NO. 230: Guilty as charged.
6	THE TIPSTAFF: 736?
7	JUROR NO. 736: Guilty.
8	THE TIPSTAFF: 739?
9	JUROR NO. 739: Guilty.
10	THE TIPSTAFF: 267?
11	JUROR NO. 267: Guilty.
12	THE TIPSTAFF: 280?
13	JUROR NO. 280: Guilty.
14	THE TIPSTAFF: And 342?
15	JUROR NO. 342: Guilty.
16	THE COURT: Thank you. Do you want them to sit
17	down and do it again? Now, the District Attorney's
18	Office wants to have me poll you, jury, regarding the
19	other two charges. Now, do you have any objection, Mr.
20	Trucilla, for us doing those together?
21	MR. TRUCILLA: No, not at all, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: We are talking two charges and these
23	are the charges involving the .357 revolver and the .22
24	caliber revolver. And your response would be guilty on
25	both charges, not guilty on both charges or one of

1	each. And we will do it all at one time. Would you do
2	that, Carla, please?
3	THE TIPSTAFF: Juror 160, if you'll please stand
4	and give your verdict?
5	JUROR NO. 160: Not guilty on both charges.
6	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 550?
7	JUROR NO. 550: Not guilty on both charges.
8	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 632?
9	JUROR NO. 632: Not guilty on both charges.
10	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 252?
11	JUROR NO. 252: Not guilty on both charges.
12	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 421?
13	JUROR NO. 421: Not guilty on both charges.
14	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 233?
15	JUROR NO. 233: Not guilty on both charges.
16	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 230?
17	JUROR NO. 230: Not guilty, both charges.
18	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 736?
19	JUROR NO. 736: Not guilty on both charges.
20	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 739?
21	JUROR NO. 739: Not guilty, both charges.
22	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 267?
23	JUROR NO. 267: Not guilty, both charges.
24	THE TIPSTAFF: Number 280?
25	JUROR NO. 280: Not guilty, both charges.

THE TIPSTAFF: Number 342? 1 JUROR NO. 342: Not guilty, both charges. 2 THE TIPSTAFF: You may be seated. THE COURT: Anything further from either of the 5 attorneys? 6 MR. TRUCILLA: Not at this time. MR. D'ALBA: Not in front of the jury, Your Honor, 7 8 no. THE COURT: Then, ladies and gentlemen, I will 9 10 dismiss you at this time, and again, thank you very 11 much. You have done a great public service. 12 (Whereupon, the jury was dismissed.) 13 THE COURT: Mr. Leuschen, you were present in the 14 courtroom when the jury rendered its verdict? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 16 THE COURT: Do you understand that you had three 17 charges and do you further understand that they found 18 you not guilty on two and guilty on one charge? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, Your Honor. 20 They found you guilty of the charge THE COURT: 21 involving in 9mm semiautomatic rifle; do you understand 22 that? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Now, Mr. Leuschen, I want to 25 tell you that you have the right to file post-verdict

motions in the nature of a Motion for New Trial or a Motion in Arrest of Judgment. I want to further tell you that only those grounds that you decide to raise in those motions will be considered by this court or by any court of appeal if you choose — you want to proceed to file an appeal, we will only consider those matters in your appeal.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: Any post-verdict -- that means matters that you want to now take care of must be in writing. These post-verdict motions must be filed within ten days following this verdict of guilty.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you fail to file the motions within that length of time, you will lose your right to appeal before this court or probably to a higher court as well. Now, you have the right to the assistance of counsel, that's a lawyer, in filing these motions and on any appeal issues that you would like to raise.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you cannot afford to retain a lawyer to represent you, I will appoint counsel for you at no cost to yourself. If you cannot afford to pay the Court costs that are associated with your appeal, the Court will see to it that those court costs are

1 2 I have explained them here to you? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 4 5 6 discussed? 7 8 9 10 11 counsel's advice. 12 13 to start with is Attorney D'Alba? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 15 16 17 18 and we can see what to provide. 19 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 20 21 22 23

24

25

paid. Now, do you understand your rights of appeal as

THE COURT: Do you have any question at all concerning these appeal rights that I have just

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I would like to question the ability to have reference to a law library and use of a typewriter and legal materials, so that I might be able to research this myself with perhaps

THE COURT: Okay. And the counsel that you want

THE COURT: Attorney D'Alba, we will talk about those matters. I don't want to decide that right now, Mr. Leuschen, but I'll discuss that with your counsel

THE COURT: Mr. Leuschen, I'm not encouraging you to file an appeal, but I'm not discouraging you either. The decision is solely up to you, but I want you to know there are very serious time constraints and you must do it properly within a right period of time or you're going to be stuck. Do you understand all of